



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Masanori SATAKE et al.

Group Art Unit: 2192

Application No.: 10/653,191

Examiner: C. JOHNSON

Filed: September 3, 2003

Docket No.: 116971

For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR SECURELY REALIZING COOPERATIVE
PROCESSING

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the July 25, 2006 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

I. 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4, 7, 10, and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter because the terms "unspecified," "specified," "predetermined," "positional," and "document," as recited in claims 2, 4, 7, 10, and 12-16, respectively, lack antecedent basis within the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, Applicants assert that the terms "unspecified," "specified," "predetermined," and "positional" carry a specific meaning either inside or outside the context of the claims. Thus, one skilled in the art would have understood and appreciated the terms